

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the time taken by the Examiner to review Applicant's present application. This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Official Action mailed March 31, 2005. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed. When the specification states the meaning that a term in the claim is intended to have, the claim is examined using that meaning, in order to achieve a complete exploration of the applicant's invention and its relation to the prior art. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989) and MPEP 2173.05(a). Applicants assert that the pending claim is not indefinite when examined using meanings defined by the specification.

In particular, the Office Action indicates that the pending claim is unclear because it would seem that the template would be served and cached instead of the DGLSC given the limitation "if said template is a cacheable template". However, paragraph 14 of the specification recites, "[t]he template generating such a page may be marked as cacheable (i.e., the generated content will be cached)." Consequently, a cacheable template, as described by the specification, is a template that generates content that will be cached. See also, paragraph 37. In view of this support in the specification, Claim 1 is not indefinite. Accordingly, Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 stands rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,744,452 ("McBrearty"). The standard for "anticipation" is one of fairly strict identity. A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987), MPEP § 2131. McBrearty does not disclose each and every element set forth in the pending claims, some distinctions of which are set forth below.

Independent Claim 1 recites:

[a] method for cache management and regeneration of dynamically-generated locale-sensitive content ("DGLSC") in one or more server computers within a client-server computer network, comprising the steps of:
receiving a request for content from a user at a client computer via a web browser;
determining said user's locale preference with an automatic locale detection algorithm;
dynamically generating said requested content from a template as a DGLSC based on said locale preference;
if said template is a cacheable template, generating a locale-sensitive filename for said DGLSC based on said locale preference and associating said DGLSC with said locale-sensitive filename;
caching said DGLSC in a locale-sensitive directory to be served in response to subsequent requests having the same locale preference; and
serving the DGLSC to said user at said client computer.

Thus, Claim 1 recites a method for cache management and regeneration of dynamically-generated locale-sensitive content ("DGLSC"). The method includes receiving a content request from a user and determining the user's locale preference with an automatic locale detection algorithm. The method also includes using a template to dynamically generate the requested content based on the determined locale preference. If the template is a cacheable template, a filename based on the locale preference is created for the generated content, and the generated content is cached in a locale-sensitive directory. Thus, subsequent requests having the same locale preference will be served the generated content having the locale-sensitive filename (i.e., the cached content). Finally, the method includes serving the generated content to the user at the client computer.

McBrearty discloses a modified web browser application for use in searching the internet and displaying web pages. The modified web browser has a cache area which caches a copy of a web page downloaded from the internet. When a page is requested, logic components within the browser determine if the page is resident in the cache area. If so, the cached page is displayed within the modified web browser with an indicator by which the user is notified that the displayed page is cached. Thus, McBrearty teaches a method for indicating whether a displayed web page was retrieved from a cache. However, McBrearty does not teach or suggest the limitations recited by Claim 1, as discussed below.

Determining the user's locale preference with an automatic locale detection algorithm

Claim 1 recites determining user locale preference with an automatic local detection algorithm. Thus, the present invention can set a preferred locale for a user based upon locale identifying information automatically extracted from the user's request for content. Locale identifying information can be extracted from a source (e.g., form post fields, accept headers, and cookies), where a number of sources are automatically evaluated in a methodical fashion. User locale identifying information may include information regarding, for example, user location (e.g., country, time zone), user currency, or user encoding, among others. Consequently, determining user locale preference may facilitate providing content appropriate to the user's locale.

In contrast, McBrearty does not appear to determine the user's locale preference with an automatic locale detection algorithm. McBrearty recites, “[i]f the web page is in the browser cache, the user's preference is read and a determination is made of whether to use the cached file instead of downloading the file from the server based on the user preference” (McBrearty – col. 9, lines 34-38). The cited portion of McBrearty recites, “[t]he user preference may be entered during setup of a web browser application, or on a prompt to the user prior to retrieving the web page” (McBrearty – col. 9, lines 39-40). Such user preference does not appear to be related to user locale. The user preference of McBrearty may be simply related to web page requests and web-page-data origin. In particular, the user preference of McBrearty may indicate whether or not the user wants to receive cached web pages if they are available. In any event, McBrearty does not teach or suggest extracting user locale-identifying information from a user's request for content with an automatic locale detection algorithm. Although McBrearty teaches prompting the user prior to retrieving a web page, prompting is not an automatic locale detection algorithm. Further, there is no teaching or suggestion in McBrearty that the user's locale preferences are determined through any methodology, prompting or otherwise. Applicant asserts that McBrearty does not teach or suggest the claimed limitation of determining the user's locale preference with an automatic locale detection algorithm.

Dynamically generating the requested content from a template as a dynamically-generated locale-sensitive content ('DGLSC') based on the locale preference

The instant application recites dynamically generating content based on locale preference. For example, paragraph 25 of the instant application recites receiving a request for content from a user and dynamically generating the requested content from a template as DGLSC based on the user locale preference. Once a visitor's locale preferences are determined, the user's locale preference can be passed to appropriate page generation engines using, for example, HTTP header extensions, as described in paragraph 43 of the specification. Thus, a user's locale preference is determined from the user's request with an algorithm, as described above, and the requested content is dynamically generated based on the locale preference.

In contrast to the claimed limitations, the cited passage of McBrearty recites handling a user request either by a remote server or by a local browser cache of data. McBrearty appears to teach choosing between providing a user with a cached web page, or downloading the same (potentially updated) web page from its server. However, McBrearty does not appear to teach either dynamically generated locale-sensitive content, or generating content based upon a user's locale preference. Thus, Applicant asserts that McBrearty does not and cannot teach or suggest dynamically generating the requested content from a template as a dynamically-generated locale-sensitive content ('DGLSC') based on the locale preference.

If the template is a cacheable template, generating a locale-sensitive filename for the DGLSC based on the locale preference and associating the DGLSC with the locale-sensitive filename

Paragraph 25 of the instant application recites, "...if the template is a cacheable template, a locale-sensitive filename can be generated for the DGLSC based on the user locale preference. The locale-sensitive filename can be associated with the DGLSC." As noted above, a cacheable template, as described by paragraph 14 of the specification, is a template that generates content that is cached. Thus, if the template is a cacheable template as defined in the specification and is used to generate dynamically-generated locale-sensitive content (i.e., DGLSC), a filename based on the user locale preference will be created for and associated with the DGLSC.

In contrast, the cited passage of McBrearty recites searching for a cached file in a user's browser cache directory if a cached file is to be used. McBrearty does not appear to teach or suggest creating filenames based on user locale preference. In fact, McBrearty does not appear to reference user locale at all, let alone with respect to selection of filenames. Consequently, Applicant asserts that McBrearty does not teach or suggest generating a locale-sensitive filename for the DGLSC based on the locale preference and associating the DGLSC with the locale-sensitive filename if the template is a cacheable template.

Caching said DGLSC in a locale-sensitive directory to be served in response to subsequent requests having the same locale preference

Paragraph 25 of the instant application recites, “[t]he DGLSC can be cached in a locale-sensitive directory, such that it can be served (and thus avoid duplicative generation of the same content) in response to subsequent requests from user's having the same locale preference.” Thus, if a user requesting content has a locale preference of, for example, Sweden, the dynamically generated locale-sensitive content generated would have a locale-sensitive filename such as, for example, “Sweden_file.” Further, the DGLSC “Sweden_file” would be cached in a locale-sensitive directory such as, for example, “Sweden_directory”. Thus, “Sweden_file” could be served in response to subsequent requests having Sweden as locale preference. Different language versions, for example, can thus be saved in different directories. For example, an English language directory and a Japanese language directory can be configured, as well as directories for other locale-sensitive attributes. It is noted that locale sensitive attributes may not be limited to country or physical locale.

In contrast, the cited passage of McBrearty recites reading a cached file from a user's browser cache directory. McBrearty does not appear to teach locale-sensitive directories corresponding to locale preferences. Applicant asserts that McBrearty does not teach or suggest caching the DGLSC in a locale-sensitive directory to be served in response to subsequent requests having the same locale preference.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants assert that McBrearty does not anticipate Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested. If the Examiner disagrees and maintains the rejection, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner specifically point out in McBrearty the features of: determining the user's locale preference with an automatic locale detection algorithm; dynamically generating the requested content from a template as a dynamically-generated locale-sensitive content ('DGLSC') based on the locale preference; if the template is a cacheable template, generating a locale-sensitive filename for the DGLSC based on the locale preference and associating the DGLSC with the locale-sensitive filename; and caching the DGLSC in a locale-sensitive directory to be served in response to subsequent requests having the same locale preference.

IDS REFERENCES

The Applicant filed an information disclosure statement (IDS) in the present application on January 3, 2003. The Applicant notes that the Office Action was not accompanied by a copy of the listing of references (Form PTO-1449) submitted with this IDS, initialed by the Examiner to indicate that the references cited therein were considered. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully request that the Examiner consider the references cited in this IDS and forward a copy of the initialed Form PTO-1449 to the Applicant.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. Other than as explicitly set forth above, this reply does not include an acquiescence to statements, assertions, assumptions, conclusions, or any combination thereof in the Office Action. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of Claim 1. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below for prompt action in the event any issues remain.

The Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-3183 of Sprinkle IP Law Group.

Respectfully submitted,

Sprinkle IP Law Group
Attorneys for Applicant



John Adair
Reg. No. 48,828

Date: June 30, 2005

1301 W. 25th Street, Suite 408
Austin, TX 78705
Tel. (512) 637-9220
Fax. (512) 371-9088